

In support of Quoy and Gaimard

by Andrew Black & Richard Schodde

Received 26 July 2013

Dickinson *et al.* (2013, this issue) have challenged our conclusion that J. R. C. Quoy & J. P. Gaimard are the authors of *Malurus textile* (Western Grasswren) and *Malurus leucopterus* (White-winged Fairy-wren), both in the family Maluridae. These species were originally collected by Quoy and Gaimard, and described by them in the zoological report (hereafter the *Zoologie*) of the *Voyage autour du monde sur les corvettes de l'Uranie et la Physicienne* under the command of Louis de Freycinet. According to Sherborn & Woodward (1901), livraison 3 in which the descriptions appeared was published on 28 August 1824. Authorship of the names was accordingly attributed to Quoy & Gaimard until Mathews (1917) noticed that C. H. F. Dumont (1824) had named and described both species in a volume of the *Dictionnaire des sciences naturelles* (hereafter the *Dictionnaire*) published on 29 May 1824. That gave Dumont priority, and authorship shifted to him until we showed (Black *et al.* 2013) that Quoy & Gaimard had supplied both the names and descriptions to Dumont. It led us to the view that they, and not Dumont, should be credited with authorship under Art. 50.1.1 of the *International code of zoological nomenclature* (ICZN 1999), hereafter the Code.

Art. 50.1.1 of the Code is pivotal. It stipulates that only if Dumont's account *makes it clear* that Quoy & Gaimard *alone* are responsible for the names and descriptions of the wrens can those workers be credited with authorship. We maintain that it does. Dickinson *et al.* (2013), on the contrary, assert that these conditions are not met, and that Quoy & Gaimard's authorship can only be determined from external evidence in their subsequently published *Zoologie*.

In developing their argument, Dickinson *et al.* (2013) have made several errors in case history. Initially, when arguing for Dumont, Dickinson (*in litt.* 7 May 2013) claimed that Dumont had added information to Quoy & Gaimard's description. As a result, Quoy & Gaimard could not be held to have satisfied the criteria for availability *alone* under Art. 50.1.1. The supposedly added information concerned a wren with a deformed bill (mandibule supérieure est très-aiguë et recourbée à sa pointe) that Dickinson *et al.* (2013) mention again above. Yet this specimen and its bill were described by Quoy & Gaimard too, and in the same (albeit edited) words, as we have already made clear (Black *et al.* 2013: paragraph 4).

Rebutted on that point, Dickinson *et al.* (2013) here shift ground, arguing now that it is not 'clear from the contents' of Dumont's account that Quoy & Gaimard are the authors of the wrens. In doing so, they stress that Dumont must have prepared his description before August 1822 when he left on a 30-month voyage of exploration in *La Coquille*. That raises questions about the nature of Quoy & Gaimard's contribution once more; yet it stems from another error. The naval officer who sailed as first lieutenant in the *Coquille* in 1822 was J. S. C. Dumont D'Urville and is not the same person as C. H. F. Dumont, the ornithologist who published *Malurus textile* and *M. leucopterus* in the *Dictionnaire* several years later. As we reported (Black *et al.* 2013), Quoy & Gaimard worked in close collaboration with Dumont the ornithologist. Mathews (1917) not only noted that they were 'very friendly' with him, but went further, recording that they 'furnished him with full particulars' of the wrens for publication.

What then is the evidence in Dumont's account for attributing authorship of the wrens to Quoy & Gaimard? Dumont (1824: 117–118) appended the new wrens to his section

on Méridon in the *Dictionnaire*. In it he does not expressly state that Quoy and Gaimard provided the descriptions or place the copied text in quotation marks. Yet the format of his account makes it clear that he is attributing the new wrens to them. Unlike entries for other species of 'mériion', he begins by special citation of Quoy & Gaimard as the finders, authors and publishers of the wrens, as follows: 'Enfin, MM. Quoy et Gaimard ont trouvé, dans leur voyage autour du monde, deux nouvelles espèces de mériions, qui ont été figurées dans l'atlas zoologique de ce voyage. Le premier qu'ils sont nommé Méridon natté, *Malurus textilis*, pl. 23, fig. 2 ... Le second est le Méridon leucoptère, *Malurus leucopterus*, Q.& G., pl. 23, fig.1...'. The plate and figures are those published in the atlas of Quoy & Gaimard's *Zoologie* which appeared around the same time as the part that included their descriptions of the wrens (Zimmer 1926: 231). Dumont followed the entry for each species with a detailed description that carries on directly from the references to Quoy & Gaimard: it reads as a transcript of information supplied by them.

To test that interpretation, we obtained an opinion from a scholar and author in the French language, Peter Hambly, a Visiting Research Fellow in French Studies, Univ. of Adelaide, whose writing is listed in the Bibliothèque nationale de France catalogue. He read only Dumont's account, responding: 'he (Dumont) appears to be quoting Quoy & Gaimard directly, transcribing what they wrote about the two new species identified by them. He is following a previous text, attributing what follows to Quoy & Gaimard. There is an *immediate* [his emphasis] impression ... that it is a straight transcription' (P. Hambly *in litt.* 19 June 2013).

As we have already pointed out (Black *et al.* 2013), Dumont's descriptions of the wrens use the same descriptive terms, phrases, clauses and sentences as Quoy & Gaimard's in the *Zoologie*. Moreover, they include accounts of the habits of the birds that are identical in wording and only Quoy & Gaimard could have supplied. Dickinson *et al.* (2013) have correctly pointed out that this evidence is external. Therefore, they argue, it is inadmissible. That opinion turns on the meaning of 'clear from the contents' in Art. 50.1.1 of the Code. Citing Art. 32.5 of the Code, which explicitly excludes external evidence, they presume that Art. 50.1.1 does too, and then make the further assumption that if external evidence was permissible, Art. 50.1.1 would have said so. But interpretation of the Code does not rely on guesswork. Apart from the fact that its exclusion under Art. 32.5 serves a different purpose (control of name-tinkering), external evidence is neither explicitly included in nor excluded from Art. 50.1.1. In this case, the external evidence merely confirms that Quoy & Gaimard's responsibility for the names and descriptions of the new wrens is 'clear from the contents' of Dumont's (1824) account. Dickinson *et al.* (2013) urge that the wording of Art. 50.1.1 should be tightened to clarify its meaning. If such tightening prevents actual authors from being, in their words, 'unfortunately and accidentally usurped', we would strongly endorse it because that, surely, is the purpose of the Article.

In summary, we find it 'clear from the contents' that Dumont's account is a direct, edited transcript of Quoy & Gaimard's descriptions, that they are therefore responsible for all information in it, and that, in consequence, Quoy & Gaimard are the legitimate authors of *Malurus textilis* and *M. leucopterus*. In suggesting that our argument relies on external evidence, Dickinson *et al.* (2013) do not read Dumont or the Code as we do. We maintain that our interpretation is consistent with the meaning and purpose of Art. 50.1.1, and, while strongly supported by external evidence, is not reliant on it.

References:

- Black, A., Schodde, R. & Préviateo, A. 2013. Early grasswren specimens in Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, and the types of Western Grasswren *Amytornis textilis* (Maluridae). *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 133: 24–30.

- Dickinson, E. C., Dubois, A. & Bour, R. 2013. The authorship of the name *Amytornis textilis*: a reply to Black, Schodde and Préviate. *Bull. Brit. Orn. Cl.* 133: 322–324.
- Dumont, C. 1824. Méridon. Pp. 114–118 in Levrault, F. G. (ed.) *Dictionnaire des sciences naturelles*, vol. 30. Levrault, Strasbourg.
- International Commission for Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN). 1999. *International code of zoological nomenclature*. Fourth edn. International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, London.
- Mathews, G. M. 1917. The rediscovery of two lost birds. *Austral Avian Rec.* 3: 79–90.
- Quoy, J. R. C. & Gaimard, J. P. 1824. *Voyage autour du monde de l'Uranie & Physicienne, zoologie*, livr. 3. Pillet Aîné, Paris.
- Sherborn, C. D. & Woodward, B. B. 1901. Notes on the dates of publication of the natural history portions of some French voyages, Part 1. *Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist.* (7)7: 388–392.
- Zimmer, J. T. 1926. Catalogue of the Edward E. Ayer Ornithological Library. *Field Mus. Nat. Hist. Zool. Ser.* 16(1): 1–364.
- Addresses:* Andrew Black, Ornithology Section, South Australian Museum, North Terrace, Adelaide SA, 5000, Australia, e-mail: abblack@bigpond.com. Richard Schodde, Australian National Wildlife Collection, CSIRO Ecosystem Sciences, G.P.O. Box 1700, Canberra, ACT 2601, Australia.